6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

standards of formal education, low level of agricultural technology, undeveloped means of transportation and too many idle days handicapped the advance of agriculture. In such circumstances the peasants did not even produce sufficient food to nourish themselves, much less a surplus to exchange for manufactured products. As a consequence the peasants were exposed to periodical famines during which many died of starvation.

Periodical epidemics of cholera, typhus, small pox, and other diseases took a toll as high as famines. A low degree of personal hygiene in crowded living conditions also increased the death rate. In addition there was a great dearth of doctors, nurses and hospitals, and no measures of preventive medicine. Equally ruinous were the periodical cattle epidemics due to primitive techniques of cattle raising. One should add to these misfortunes the figure of more than one hundred thousand peasant homes destroyed each summer by fires, many of them the result of arson. And if one considers the widely spread robbery, theft and murder that went undetected and unpunished, one gets an idea of the distressing personal and social conditions in which the Russian peasant lived. It was in such circumstances, left entirely to his own resources, that he developed an ideological, emotional and symbolical world of his own.

17
THE ATTITUDES OF THE PEASANTRY

I

STUNNED by the magnitude of the inimical and arbitrary social and physical forces which surrounded him and completely controlled his life, the Great-Russian peasant felt impotent and helpless. In the family circle if he had to be submissive and he was exposed to arbitrariness of the elder, he also might have enjoyed a certain degree of protection and succor.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

of strata, whose interests were often conflicting. There were the *obshchiniki* (the communal landholders), the *otrubniki* (the peasant private property owners), the *khutoriane* (isolated homestead owners), the *bednyaki* (the poor and indebted peasants), the *serednyaki* (the middle peasants), and the *kulaki*. Finally, there were still the pomeshchiki who owned manorial estates with arable lands, timber-forests and pasture grounds. These were, however, gradually selling their land to the better-off peasants.

The peasant private landholders prospered better than those in the communes. The yield per acre on communal lands has always been much lower than on the private lands. The communal landholders had to rely for a part of their income on wages. These they got as seasonal industrial workers or as agricultural laborers on the lands of the landed gentry. They also worked on the lands of better-off individual peasant property owners whom they resented and called *"novye pomeshchiki"* (the new squires). The poor, landless, and indebted peasants antagonized the better-off peasants. The lower and the middle peasants resented the kulaks and the pomeshchiki.

At the same time the individualization of the Great-Russian peasantry was proceeding very slowly in spite of government help and encouragement. By 1912 the proportion of consolidated peasant holdings, as compared to those remaining in the communal system, was less than 11 percent. Between 1907 and 1915 only about 20 percent of the peasants left land commune.[16] This slow decommunalization did not, however, indicate lack of desire for private land ownership. The reasons for the persistence of the old communal land system lay in the shortage of land, in peasant poverty, in vested interests within the village commune, and finally in traditional lack of self-reliance among the peasants.

As long as a large part of the Great-Russian peasantry remained in the system of communal landholding where lack of initiative and primitive techniques of cultivation prevailed, no great general improvement in land cultivation and in the standard of living of the peasantry could have been expected in spite of all government efforts. Thus, economically insecure and

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

hungry for land, resentful of degrading dependency and inclined to be hostile to the existing authorities, many peasants were ready to follow the leadership of professional conspirators and demagogues who incited them to revolt and promised them "land and freedom." Such feelings and attitudes were of decisive importance in the revolutionary days of 1917, as well as later in the civil war.

20
ASCENDENCY OF BOLSHEVISM

I

WHEN the Czardom in the eighteenth century embarked on its policy of industrialization, the newly built industries, both those state owned and those owned by the landed nobility, were based on serf labor. Also the non-noble entrepreneurs purchased or rented serfs to work in their mines and factories.[1] In such conditions the technical equipment and the production output of Russia's industries remained at a very low level. There was no incentive to introduce technological improvements as long as the labor was abundant, and its cost low. Only a few industries, such as the cotton industry which was in the hands of non-noble owners, and which from its start was based on free labor, had introduced modern machinery.

Thus since the Russian industries did not advance technologically and were unable to compete with the European industrial products, they had to be protected by high tariff barriers, by grants and subsidies. This situation kept the level of prices of manufactured goods high in comparison with the buying power of the industrial workers, of peasants and of middle urban strata. The resulting lack of buying power of these broad strata of the population made the progress of industrialization in Russia very slow, uneven, unstable, and chronically affected by crises

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

welcomed them as liberators in World War II, indicate such possibilities.

III

In studying personality growth in the Soviet society, one should take into account also the differences between the urban and the rural environments and the influences of those environments on interpersonal relations within the family circle. Owing to the very rapid pace of urbanization and low rate of production of consumption goods, most of the families located in the urban areas are exposed to the housing shortage and lack of home privacy. Many of these families live in community apartments in which there is only one room per family and in which a number of unrelated families share a common kitchen and toilet facilities. Family conflicts and tensions tend to be intensified in such circumstances. Lack of privacy, noisiness, and lack of sleep in crowded quarters, together with the lack of sufficient food, long hours of work and unsatisfactory conditions of work increase dissatisfactions and magnify existing family conflicts. An outlet for dissatisfactions is found then in trivial scandals and bickering, in petty squabbles, but also in violent emotional outbursts.[31]

Conditions in rural areas are somewhat different. Though virtually all peasant families live in one or at most two-room cottages, which they often share with a few heads of livestock, yet the rural family does have its own privacy. Most peasant families possess a small lot of land around the cottage, on which they raise some poultry or a pig; some might even own a cow. Though this is all very modest, yet with some labor, after the work for the kolhoz has been done, the peasant family has been able to raise some food on its own property and perhaps to sell it on the open market and then buy some clothing and other bare necessities.[32]

Compared to the situation of the city worker, the peasant, though receiving lower wages for his work, and often going in rags, perhaps does feel relatively more independent. If he is an adult with a family he is much less likely to be pushed around, though he is constantly exhorted by kolhoz officials to work more

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

and harder and to produce more for Socialist Motherland. Not infrequently the brigade leaders have to use physical force to make him get up early enough to work on collective property.

Yet in spite of such unfavorable circumstances, compared to city workers, the peasant might still be in a somewhat better position in regard to security and stability, attachment to his family, to his cottage, to his small plot of land, and to his village. For this reason he has been able to put up resistance against the Party and the government.[33] It is against these scanty remnants of emotional and economic security, of personal independence, of group solidarity and resistance that the Bolshevik rulers are campaigning; it is to eradicate this psychology of group intimacy and opposition that the Party had recently attempted to resettle the farmers and move them into concentrated and urbanized surroundings; the Bolsheviks are exerting all efforts to eradicate these "residues of kulak psychology" root and branch and to make the peasants as completely helpless, insecure and subdued to the Party will as they have done with the industrial and intellectual workers.

There is a considerable disproportion in sex ratio in Soviet rural areas. Owing to great casualties in wars it is estimated that at present there are about fifteen million more women than men in the Soviet Union. And due to the increasing need of manpower to maintain huge military forces and to feed the inefficient city industries, the Soviet leaders are constantly draining both male youths and adult men from the villages in the form of military and labor drafts. They are therefore increasingly relying for agricultural work on peasant women. Hence peasant villages and peasant families tend to be composed predominantly of women.

Here too a family structure with semi-matriarchal traits, similar to the Old-Slavonic family, is being formed. Though in such circumstances the number of illegitimate children is increasing, it is quite possible that the women, especially those who are traditionally strongly attached to their family, are exerting a moderating and softening influence on the personality of the peasant child. An indication of such possible differences in the psychological atmosphere of the city and the country is given in